UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/158,099	09/22/1998	KENJI MIWA	0163-0707-2X	3529

22850 7590 08/02/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
LIN, KUANG Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1725	

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/158,099	MIWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuang Y. Lin	1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15,18,20,21,23 and 25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15,18,20,21,23 and 25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 15, 18 and 20, 21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 15, lines 6-7, it recites "at a current value and a Tesla value". In claim 15 line 11 and claim 21, last line, respectively, it also recites "at **a** current value and **a** Tesla value". It is not clear whether they refer the same or different current value and Tesla value.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 15, 18 and 20, 21, 23 and 25 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vives

Vives discloses a grain refinement method for aluminum alloy (page 448, left col., last paragraph and right col., 4th complete paragraph) by applying an electric current and a magnetic field simultaneously (page 446, right col., 3rd complete paragraph and the junction paragraph between pages 447 and 448) to the molten aluminum alloy during a solidification process at temperature lower than a liquidus of the alloy (page 446, right col., last paragraph, page 447, right col., second complete paragraph and page 449, right col., 1st complete paragraph). Although he does not mention the feature of shifting a refined material to a periphery of a container to yield the refined material concentrated in an end portion of the metallic material, apparently, his process will produce the same result as that of applicants since he performs the identical process steps as that of applicants. In short, Vives substantially shows the invention as claimed except that he does not show the container is in cylindrical shape. However, it would have been obvious to use the container of any configuration in the process of Vives depending on the designated metallic casting article to be obtained.

5. Claims 15, 18 and 20, 21, 23 and 25 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radjai et al.

Radjai et al. substantially show the invention as claimed except that they do not show the shape of the container. However, it would have been obvious to use any shape of the container as long as it will confine the hyper-eutectic Al-SI alloys for performing the electromagnetic vibrations effect on the alloy during solidification process. With respect to claim 23, it would have been obvious to

manipulate the process parameters to obtain the designated grain size through routine experimentation.

6. Claims 15, 18 and 20, 21, 23 and 25 insofar as definite **(assuming that Radjai et al do add particles to the molten metal)** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radjai et al and further in view of Vives.

Radijai et al substantially show the invention as claimed except they does not disclose to crush solid crystals into small pieces during a solidification process at temperatures lower than the liquidus. However, Vives discloses two distinct causes of grain refinement, represented by fluid flow and cavitation phenomena, in a solidifying liquid metal (see page 448, right col. last paragraph). In the absence of cavitation and for a sufficient intensity of the oscillating flow, the columnar-dendritic crystallization is replaced by a microstructure characterized by the formation of agglomeration of globular particles. On the other hand, when an alloy is solidified in the presence of well-developed cavitation situations, a very fine and homogeneous microstructure has been observed throughout ingot (see page 449, right col. second paragraph and page 454, left col. second paragraph). He also discloses that gas content in the liquid metal (see page 449, left col. second paragraph) and the intensity of magnetic pressure contributed to the cavitation phenomena (see page 449, left col. last paragraph through page 449, right col. last paragraph). It would have been obvious to manipulate the gas content of aluminum alloy and the magnetic pressure during the solidification process of Radjai et al in view of Vives such that to obtain well-developed

cavitation situations in the molten metal at the temperature lower than the liquidus and thereby to better refine the grain structure. It would have been obvious to use the container of any configuration in the process of Vives depending on the designated metallic casting article to be obtained.

7. Applicant's arguments filed July 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In page 8, 2nd paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that three current values applied to the molten metal during the casting process. However, the specification does not provide an antecedent basis for the stated features.

b. In page 8, 3rd paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that Vives does not thoroughly examine the magnetohydrodynamic phenomena occurring during the test and they fails to disclose or suggest the applicant's claimed step of "shifting the small pieces to a periphery of a cylindrical tube or container with the alternating current and the magnetic field." However, Vives does use the alternating current and the magnetic field to create cavitation phenomena during solidification of molten metal. The process is the same as that of instant application (see, for example, page 3, last paragraph of instant specification). since the strength of current and magnetic in Vives is so large that it generates cavitation within the molten metal, it would expect that the small pieces in the solidifying molten metal will be shifted to the periphery of the container.

c. In page 9, 2nd paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that in Vives the pinching force cannot be successfully generated since the molten metal sample

is in a vessel having free surface. However, the pinching force is generated by the interaction between the magnetic field and the alternative current (see page 12, last paragraph of applicant's remarks). Thus, the pinching force will be generated in the molten metal mass with or without the free surface.

d. In page 9, 3rd paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that in Vives the container is made of stainless steel and some of the electric current passes through vessel will be loss in producing Joule heat. However, it is understood in the art that stainless steel is substantially transparent to the magnetic field. Thus, the loss will be minimum. Further, since the cavitation is generated in the molten metal mass, it is apparent that the strength of the current and the magnetic field must be great enough to crush the particles. Applicant further stated that in Vives the strength of the magnetic field is about 1/10 of the instant invention. However, it is a common knowledge that a greater force will be generated as the strength of the magnetic field is applied. It would have been obvious to apply a stronger magnetic field to the molten metal of Vives shall a greater force for generating a greater cavitation phenomena is designated.

e. In page 10, last paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that in Vives the very fine and homogeneous microstructure has been observed throughout the ingot. However, in page 451, right col. 3rd paragraph of Vives, it discloses that the inhomogeneous structure is observed due to intensity variation of the cavitation.

f. In page 11, 2nd through 4th paragraphs of the remarks applicant stated that the shape and the material of the container or vessel are very important element to generate the shifting. However, as stated supra, the pinching force is generated by the interaction between the magnetic field and the alternative current (see page 12, last paragraph of applicant's remarks). Thus, the shape is not deemed to be a decisive factor, if any, for the shifting phenomena. Further, as it is stated supra that stainless steel is substantially transparent to the magnetic field. Thus, the loss will be minimum. Accordingly, it is expected that a shifting of metal particles occurs in Vives.

g. In page 12, 3rd paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that in the process of Radjai the silicon carbide particles is added to the molten metal and the particles of the instant application is smaller than that of Radjai. However, applicant did not provide any evidence for supporting the allegation. Radjai et al. states that "suspended silicon particles multiplied in number with a reduction in size by vibrations at temperatures higher than the liquidus and agglomerated and **repelled to the outer surface** after the start of solidification." Thus, Radjai et al. starts to apply the vibrations at the temperature higher than the liquidus and **shift** the particles to the **outer surface** during solidification process. Applicant further stated that Radjai et al. do not apply an alternating current and a magnetic field simultaneously at a current value and a Tesla value configured to crush solid crystal particles of the solidifying metallic material into small pieces. However, in last two lines of Radjai et al. it states that "metallographic observations showed

that the cavitation phenomenon was a main responsible for the **crushing of the suspended silicon particles.**" Thus, applicant's argument is not deemed to be persuasive.

h. In page 13, 1st paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that "repulsion" and "shifting" are different. However, the particles **are moved** whether they are repelled or shifted. It appears to be that phenomena in Radjai et al. and in the instant application are the same though the wordings are different.

i. In page 15, 1st paragraph of the remarks applicant stated that in Radjai et al. the particles are agglomerated/enlarged. However, the scope of the claim does not exclude that feature.

8. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kuang Y. Lin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

7-27-06